

**J. A. KEMP & CO.**

CHARTERED PATENT AGENTS

14, SOUTH SQUARE, GRAY'S INN,  
LONDON, WC1R 5EU

TELEPHONE: 01-405 3292

CABLES: KEMPATENT

TELEX: No. 23676

J. A. KEMP, B.Sc., F.R.I.C., C.P.A.  
J. C. EVERETT, BA., F.R.I.C., C.P.A.  
S. J. ALLEN, BA., F.R.I.C., C.P.A.  
C. R. HAIGH, MA., C.P.A.  
J. A. G. COLLIER, MA., C.P.A.  
T. J. WILLIAMS, MA., C.P.A.  
T. H. P. RICHARDSON, BA., C.P.A.  
D. L. CANNON, MA., C.P.A.  
H. F. KELLY, C.P.A.  
R. N. G. LINGWOOD, BA., C.P.A.  
W. G. F. ALLEN, BA., C.P.A.  
J. G. HARRISON, BA., C.P.A.  
D. M. GOLDIN, B.Sc., C.P.A.  
P. B. MYERSCOUGH, MA., C.P.A.  
R. F. FAWCETT, MA., D.Phil., C.P.A.  
P. G. A. ELLIS-JONES, MA., C.P.A.

G. S. PERRYMAN

A. P. BUTLER (OFFICE MANAGER)

AIRMAIL

3rd August, 1971.

George J. Brandt, Jr.,  
Watson, Leavenworth, Kelton & Taggart,  
100, Park Avenue,  
New York, 17,  
New York,  
U.S.A.

**RECEIVED**

WLK&T

8386/71 AUG 6 1971

FILE 582-703 B B

Dear Sir,

British Patent Application No. 35507/71  
Philip Morris Incorporated. Case 582-703 GB.  
Our Ref: TR/IF Folio A/17759

We refer to your instructions of June 8th 1971, and confirm that this application was filed on 28th July 1971, claiming Convention priority (U.S.A.) of August 13th 1970. We enclose the Filing Certificate, from which you will see that the Application No. is 35507/71.

Before filing, we revised the claims to put them in a form more suited to British practice and enclose two of the revised claims and of the formal front page which we added. The descriptive part of the specification will require some amendment in due course, but this can conveniently wait until the first Official Letter issues.

We draw your attention to the following points which we noted when preparing the revised claims. They are all matters which can be satisfactorily dealt with during prosecution.

(1) Although we have of course retained the product claims, we think it is probably right to regard this invention as being primarily for a process. We have, therefore, put the process claims first.

Cont....


2026528450

(2) The descriptive part of your specification is in some respects broader than the process claims you sent us, and we have drafted the British process claims broadly to cover everything disclosed. Thus the revised claim 1 does not include, as necessary features, the comminution step (apparently either before or after the hydrolysis step, or both - see your Claim 9 and Page 2, lines 21-23); the demethylation step; or the use of alkaline earth metal cations in the cross-linking step. These features are of course included in subordinate claims. The revised claims can of course be restricted further during prosecution if you so wish, and just in case we have inadvertently made an error we have included your process claims (as claims 28-32) to serve as a basis for amendment; these claims will have to be cancelled in due course.

(3) We have also increased the number of features covered by specific subordinate claims, since this is desirable under British practice.

Our note of charges is enclosed.

Yours faithfully,

  
J.A. Kemp & Co.

2026528451